Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The claims have been rewritten to define the invention with greater particularity over the art. They now clearly define the instant invention.

Claim 19 is the equivalent to amended claim 13 presented with the not-entered amendment after final of 26 December 2007.

US patent 3,961,780 of Saj is not relevant because it refers to an indexing system where the minimum resolution is given by the difference between the pitch of one tooth of the first toothed element of the first coupling and the pitch of one tooth of the second toothed element rf the first coupling. In fact in US '780 the inner wheel has 360 teeth each of 1° while the outer wheel has 400 teeth each of 0.9°, and the minimum resolution is (1 tooth X 1°)-(1 tooth X 0.9°) = 0.1°.

US patent 4,463,488 of Pieczulewski shows an arrangement where the minimum resolution is given by the difference between the pitch of more than one tooth of the first toothed element of the first coupling and the pitch of more than one tooth of the second

toothed element of the first coupling. For example if the inner wheel has 125 teeth each of 2.88° while the outer wheel has 288 teeth each of 1.25°, the minimum resolution is (53 teeth X 1.25°)-(23 teeth X 2.88°) = 0.01°.

One of the main differences between the present invention and Pieczulewski is how the instant invention provides provide high accuracy positioning. Pieczulewski refers exclusively to a work table with indexing apparatus. From this one can clearly appreciate (FIGS. 6 and 7) that the orientation of the treatment head having the spindle 214 for the cutter 212 is always fixed and the machining accuracy depends on the tilting angle of the table top 224 obtained by means of wedges 234, 236.

The present invention makes possible high accuracy machining with a treatment head having a special indexing apparatus. Neither of the above-cited US patent references discloses the concept of obtaining high accuracy machining by adjusting the treatment head with a special indexing apparatus. One skilled would not be encouraged to transfer to a treating head the teaching of equipping a work table with an indexing apparatus due to the fact that in general a work table and a treatment head work in a very different condition. i.e. the first one works in a static condition (the workpiece is kept fixed when machined) and the second one works in a dynamic condition (the tool has to rotate for machining the workpiece).

In sum, Pieczulewski positions the cutter 212 by exchanging wedges 226 and 228 with wedges 234 and 236. This is a far cry from the system of this invention. The same is true for Saj.

Respectfully submitted,
K.F. Ross P.C.

*//Andrew Wilford//*

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

03 March 2008
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: *email@kfrpc.com*

Enclosure:
None.